



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/033,496	12-28-2001	Yeh-Hung Lai	81850PAL	8406

7590 07-01/2003

Paul A. Leipold
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER
CHIANG, VICTOR S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1771	

DATE MAILED: 07-01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/033,496

Applicant(s)

LAI ET AL.

Examiner

Victor S Chang

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 0606.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-9, drawn to an imaging member, classified in class 428, subclass 304.4.
 - II. Claims 10-17, drawn to a method of cutting an imaging member, classified in class 396, subclass 613.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions Group I and Group II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product such as cutting non-coated plain papers.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. During a telephone conversation with Paul Leipold on 6/25/2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-9. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Claims 10-17 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Specification

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

It appears that the instantly claim invention is a continuation of both U. S. Application 09/723,518 and/or 09/723,682, now issued U.S. Patent No. 6537656 and 6447976, respectively. The Examiner suggests amend the Specification on page 1 to include proper continuation data.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The term "flange" in claim 1 is used by the claim to mean "skin", "cover" or "outer", while the accepted meaning is "A protruding rim, edge, rib, or collar, as on a wheel or a pipe shaft, used to strengthen an object, hold it in place, or attach it to another object" (The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition copyright © 1992 by Houghton Mifflin Company). The term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term.

Also, in claim 2, line 2 and throughout the remaining claims, the term "caliper" is used by the claim to mean "thickness", while the accepted meaning is "An instrument consisting essentially of two curved hinged legs, used to measure thickness and distances" (The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition copyright © 1992 by Houghton Mifflin Company). The term is also indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term. The Examiner suggests change "caliper" to --thickness--.

Further, in claim 1, the structural relations of the claimed elements are vague and indefinite. For example, at line 3, the phrase "upper and lower" fails to clearly claim their structural relations to the imaging layer and the foam core. The Examiner suggests to re-write the claim so as to clearly claim the structural relations.

Double Patenting

9. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

10. Claims 1-8 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 12, 18, 19 and 21-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6537656 to Dontula et al. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the following reasons:

For claims 1-9, claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 12, 18, 19 and 21-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6537656 disclose all the features of instantly claimed invention, except an express teaching of the toughness of the foam core sheet and the skin (or flange) sheets. However, it is noted that Dontula does teach that the skin (or flange) sheets are chosen to satisfy specific requirements of flexural modulus, etc. to alleviate the cutting problems (column 4, line 63 to column 5, line 19). As such, it is believed that a suitable toughness is either inherently disclosed by Dontula, or an obvious optimization to one of ordinary in the art, motivated by the desire to minimize the cutting problems.

Art Unit: 1771

11. Claims 1-8 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 9 and 10-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6447976 to Dontula et al. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other for the following reasons:

For claims 1-9, claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 9 and 10-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6447976 disclose all the features of instantly claimed invention, except express teachings of the modulus and toughness of the foam core sheet and the skin (or flange) sheets. However, it is noted that Dontula does teach that the skin (or flange) sheets are chosen to satisfy specific requirements of flexural modulus, etc. to alleviate the cutting problems (column 5, line 45 to column 6, line 2). It should be noted that a suitable thickness of skin layer is clearly inherently disclosed by claims 3 and 8. As such, it is believed that a suitable toughness is either inherently disclosed by Dontula, or an obvious optimization to one of ordinary in the art, motivated by the desire to minimize the cutting problems.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor S Chang whose telephone number is 703-605-4296. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel H Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 10/033,496

Page 7

Art Unit: 1771

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

VSC
June 27, 2003

DANIEL J. JEFFERSON
RECEIVED EXHIBIT
GROUP 1-00

K. J. L.